

Date: Sat, 16 Jul 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #313
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 16 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 313

Today's Topics:

11 meters taking it back!!
Does CW as a pre-req (2 msgs)
Emergency TX on police freq.
Thoughts on CW testing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 20:50:54 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!news.tc.cornell.edu!
travelers.mail.cornell.edu!news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: 11 meters taking it back!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <306g76\$20i@news.u.washington.edu> cummings@u.washington.edu (Mike Cummings)
writes:

>In article <304u2e\$gl7@fnnews.fnal.gov>, <rmike@FNAL0.FNAL.GOV> wrote:
>> I've heard some nosies made about trying to take back 11 meters,
>> if so I'm all for it because when 10 meters gets hot so will
>> 11 and that gives us DX advantage.

>I'm not going to yell, but I will say I think the fact that there are about
>8 jillion CB rigs floating around out there makes this pretty impractical.
>I don't think there's any going back on this one. Even if the FCC made 11
>meters an Amateur band by fiat, you're never going to have anything at 27

>MHz except a QRM ghetto.

By a similar logic, I guess we never have to worry about the FCC taking away the 2-meter ghetto either!

--

kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
|
| Call 1-800-682-1776
| for more information.

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 21:31:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Does CW as a pre-req
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>In article <071494061943Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) writes:

>>(Yes a whole 38% of amateurs surveyed (by the ARRL) use CW regularly.
>>Yes this MEGA-EFFICIENT mode uses half the spectrum (a NH6IL survey
>>showed) and this PROVES how wonderfull it is that about a third of
>>the hams can HOG half the avaiilable bandwith!!!!!! Thats efficient boy!)
>>

>Help me out here, Dan. How does CW "use" half the spectrum? I'll give
>you the benefit of assuming you mean HF spectrum. First of all, there
>is *no* CW-only spectrum on HF (unless you're a Novice). Every HF
>Hertz is also legal for at least two other modes.. As for spectrum
>*used*, CW is traditionally in the lower 50kHz or so of most bands,
>while in some of the smaller bands it seems to occupy only the lowest
>10-15 kHz. In addition to this, there is another CW concentration in
>the Novice segments, though there are data transmissions to be heard
>here as well (rudely so if they are US stations, IMHO, since Novices
>are not allowed to use that mode). So how does all this add up to
>"half the spectrum"? And don't tell me that NH6IL told you so, because
>I know that he knows better.

Obviously he does not, as he keeps stating it as fact. If you had bothered to read what you quoted you would have seen that I credited HIS survey as the source for the data. Personally I disagree that the use is that high, and apparently you do to.

>Turns out to be a mighty skinny HOG when you get up close, I'd say.

In bandwidth or Q?

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 20:57:08 GMT

From: lerc.nasa.gov!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!

mjsilva@purdue.edu

Subject: Does CW as a pre-req

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <071494061943Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) writes:

>(Yes a whole 38% of amateurs surveyed (by the ARRL) use CW regularly.
>Yes this MEGA-EFFICIENT mode uses half the spectrum (a NH6IL survey
>showed) and this PROVES how wonderfull it is that about a third of
>the hams can HOG half the available bandwidth!!!!!! Thats efficient boy!)
>

Help me out here, Dan. How does CW "use" half the spectrum? I'll give you the benefit of assuming you mean HF spectrum. First of all, there is **no** CW-only spectrum on HF (unless you're a Novice). Every HF Hertz is also legal for at least two other modes.. As for spectrum **used**, CW is traditionally in the lower 50kHz or so of most bands, while in some of the smaller bands it seems to occupy only the lowest 10-15 kHz. In addition to this, there is another CW concentration in the Novice segments, though there are data transmissions to be heard here as well (rudely so if they are US stations, IMHO, since Novices are not allowed to use that mode). So how does all this add up to "half the spectrum"? And don't tell me that NH6IL told you so, because I know that he knows better.

Turns out to be a mighty skinny HOG when you get up close, I'd say.

73,

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 15 Jul 1994 13:46:39 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!paris.ics.uci.edu!

news.cwi.com!netcomsv!dodge!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Csspto.30D@csn.org>, Joel F. Frederick <joelf@csn.org> wrote:

>John O. Feher (feher@netcom.com) wrote:

>: A question to all:

>: Suppose a ham radio operator is in a

>: life-threatening emergency with a modified radio

>: in his hand. Should he attempt to call/break in

>: on a public safety (ie police) dispatch freq.

>

>: Would this be legal in case of a true e,mergency?

>: Would it work or are such main dispatch frequencies

>: "protected" by some squelch system?

>

>I believe that I read a of a case in So. California where this happened,

>if memory serve, the guy tried repeaters & cell phones and finally made

>the call on public safety freq's. He had his radio (license as well?)

>taken away, the justification was that it was not FCC type accepted for

>those frequencies.

If this is the same story I heard, the ham was exonerated. Naturally the police confiscated his radio, but mainly that was due to their ignorance of emergency justified transmissions. If I remember right after a few weeks and a call to the local mayor by an ARRL representative, his radio was returned intact.

73,
km6wt

Date: 15 Jul 1994 20:57:12 GMT
From: agate!kennish@ames.arpa
Subject: Thoughts on CW testing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9406157743.AA774303460@mails.imed.com>,

Mack Ray <mack@mails.imed.COM> wrote:

> 3) My proposal

>

> If you can agree that encouraging technically minded persons to become
> amateurs is now at least as important as operational skills (if not
> more so), then I believe that we could restructure the current testing
> to entice these individuals into our ranks. I propose a "dual ladder"
> testing structure which would allow the same operating privileges for
> amateurs who demonstrate proficiency in one of two ways. The first

> way would be exactly as it is now where a general, advanced and extra
 > are tested exactly as they are now. The second ladder would be aimed
 > at technical license holders. The following elements would be
 > required for general and advanced:

>	general	advanced technical element,	general rules element	5 wpm code
>	advanced	extra technical element,	advanced rules element	5 wpm code

>

> The only way to be an extra would be to demonstrate BOTH operation
 > skill and technical skill. I believe that CW should still be a part
 > of advanced license testing, but it should only be necessary to
 > demonstrate MINIMUM skills. The advantage of this design is that the
 > FCC does not have to change its computers or add any new testing
 > elements. If the FCC were interested in making the technical ladder
 > more valuable, they could add a new technical element above the extra
 > and use the extra element for general and the new element for
 > advanced.

>

> Please note that the current reasoning for an advanced class license
 > is to promote technical improvement. This is the first license where
 > "more technically difficult" modes of operation are allowed on HF.

Interesting. But your argument is based on the fallacy that the technical side of the current exams really do demonstrate technical excellence and knowledge, and by studying for them, you promote technical education. We all know that this is false.

First, by having question pools, it is possible for a technically incompetent but a good memorizer to pass the Extra written with flying colors.

Second, the material covered in the exam is mostly outmoded and insufficient to demonstrate an individual's ability to advance the state of radio art as it exists in the 1990s. Most extras today couldn't pass a 1960s style written, when you had to go into the FCC office and DRAW CIRCUITS. Can you draw a Colpitts oscillator? A Hartley? A Pierce? Explain the differences, and why one would use one over another? Can you draw an impedance matching network to transform the output of an RF transistor to a resonant antenna? Use a Smith Chart? How about a practical exam, say doing the RF plumbing for a repeater complete with directional couplers, isolators, and cavities?

I am not saying that these are required to be a good amateur operator, but if you want to implement parallel tracks for "advancement" in the amateur licensing scheme, then make it worth something. A person with these (or similar) skills would be a great asset to the amateur community.

What stymies me to this day is why the entire 50 MHz and up spectrum is given to anyone passing the Tech exam. If there is any spectrum where the correlation between technical ability and ability to use the bands exists, it would be in the upper frequencies. If you want to promote the technical ladder, the "carrot" should be slices of VHF and up segments, unless the FCC wants all of us to be "appliance operators."

My 2 cents. Oh, the above is not intended to cast any opinion on the CW portion of this proposal. I'm staying out of that one, as usual :-)

==Ken

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #313
